Tape: 023

Transcript of Interview with Cy Jamison

Conducted by Jim Muhn

January 10, 1991

***Disclaimer**: The Bureau of Land Management Library does not verify the accuracy of the accounts by participants in the Oral History Project. Individual stories are voluntarily submitted and are placed in the Library's permanent collection. These histories are the personal recollections and perspectives of participating individuals and are not intended as a substitute for an official record of the federal government. Transcripts have not been edited and may contain errors.*

INTERVIEW OF CY JAMISON

This is an oral history interview with Cy Jamison, Director of the Bureau of Land Management, taken in Washington, DC, on January 10, 1991, with Jim Muhn, Land Law Historian from the Service Center in Denver, Colorado.

JIM: Okay, Mr. Jamison, this is the first question that everybody is always asked. Could you give me a brief biographical sketch of your career before you came to the Bureau of Land Management?

CY: Step back. I worked part-time on a fire crew for the Forest Service during my summers right out of high school and that's how I earned my money to go to school. I went to school in Eastern Montana College in Billings. And through that experience, in my last year.

JIM: Which was?

CY: Which would be 1970. I got a job with BLM on a fire crew so that's how I ended up coming over to the BLM. And I worked as a dispatcher in the Montana State Office starting part-time in 1970. And that was my first brush with the BLM and prior to that I worked about three summers with the Forest Service. So, then during, I got on also part-time during the school year just for some pickup money. So, I worked, I think, all the year of ’70 and ’71 school years, that type of thing. But upon graduation that spring, I went back on the fire crew there and one thing led to another, and I just ended up all different types of temporary jobs and finally ending up bagging what we use to call way back then was a WAE. I don't even know if they have them anymore or not. And that's how I got on with the BLM and I spent with the BLM about 10 years and that would be basically from about ’71 on a full-time basis until March 1st of ’81 and in that time period, I was a fire dispatcher, I was an employee development specialist, a use program manager and then finally in public affairs. And then from there, I went to work on the House Interior Committee for Congressman Marlenee who was the representative from Montana. I worked for him in

two or three different positions, all on the committee. We started off with the oversight investigations subcommittee, we worked on that. And then we worked on time of, let's see where was I at? I ended up on the House Interior Committee to start off working in oversight investigations subcommittee. We worked on that a couple of years. Then we moved over to the House Interior Committee, Subcommittee on Public Lands and that was just that subcommittee then. And then finally, they combined Public Lands and National Parks. I worked on that for Congressman Marlenee. Had one little stint where you come downtown, and it was the House Liaison which is kind of your relationship with the Secretary of the Interior. I worked about 4 months for Secretary James Watt and about 4 months for Secretary Bill Clark as their representative up on the House side. And then I went back to Montana and went back to work for Congressman Marlenee as his Field Director and then after the election, I came back to work on the House Interior Committee. And then President Bush appointed me to be the Director of the BLM and the Senate confirmed me on June 23rd of 1990. And been ever since.

JIM: Okay.

CY: I think that's right, isn't it? Yeah, 1990.

JIM: You were also, weren't you, on the City Council in Billings, Montana, during part of that time?

CY: Oh, yeah. I think I was, at one time in Billings, I was on the City Council for over a year. I was, I got beat by 16 votes and about 2 weeks after that, the guy that beat me, something come up in his personal life, and he moved and so I got the job anyway. So, I come in second but ended up in first. And I also at that time, I was pretty active civically, I was the President of the Billings Exchange Club or Breakfast Exchange Club. I was on the board of like the credit union, Big Brothers and Sisters, the MC Foundation, I was Vice President of that, not the Foundation but the Alumni Association. And did a

lot of community work there. It's real rewarding and you don't realize it but if you work hard, you've got time for it.

JIM: While you were on Capitol Hill all that time working on all these various Interior committees, subcommittees, sub-subcommittees, did you still have a lot of contact with the Bureau of Land Management.

CY: Oh absolutely. First of all, I got to be fairly close friends with Bob Burford who held this position before I. And also, as most of the legislation I worked on dealt directly with the BLM be it various private relief bills which would straighten out surveys and things of that nature to major efforts like the oil and gas reform act. We did the royalty accounting act. We did a lot of those major things. Also, the Coal Amendments Act. A lot of those things which were directly tied to the BLM. In fact, most of the, surprisingly, about 1/4 of all the legislation that passes the House of Representatives comes out of that one committee and the majority of that comes out of that one subcommittee in the House of Representatives Public Lands and National Parks Committee. And so, you get, when you work up there, you get a real broad deal. I did a lot of floor work right down on the House floor, managed quite a few bills down there and I remember one time we had what they call a suspension calendar which means if two-thirds of those there vote in favor of it, it passes, and you don't have to go through all the other steps with it. And one time, we had like 22 bills on what we call the {**spension**} calendar at one time. So, we got, I got a lot of good experience. It was probably one of the most rewarding positions I had up there. One of things that was a backstep, though, is real helpful is when I was on the City Council, I was, Billings was very active in Montana's legal{?} cities and towns and I was on the committee, the Legislative Committee. And so, I learned the procedures up at the Montana State legislature. I testified in front of legislature. And surprisingly, the procedures are almost identical to the ones back here when I came to work for Congress. And that was really help. I had a lot, one step up on a lot of freshman staff members. So, I got some good experience out of Montana.

JIM: Well, good. Well, then we'll go on to your being appointed as Director. Can you tell us how that came about? Did you lobby for the job or was this sort of a bolt of lightning out of?

CY: First of all, I want to back up. Basically, this is a political appointee position and I'll back up. I signed on to support President Bush to be nominated the day after Ronald Reagan was nominated for his second term. So, I signed on with the Bush team. I was one of the early ones on. I helped organize in Montana what they used to call the Fund for America's Future which was usually a predecessor to a campaign these days. I was very active in that. I became the Washington representative for the Bush campaign from Montana. I also helped in some other western states. And when President Bush won, which I thought he would do four years prior to that, I was asked to submit my resume and I was asked to submit the jobs I'd like to be considered for. And to be honest with you, my first choice was the Bureau of Land Management. (A) because I knew the operation and (B) is I thought it would be kind of like coming home. And I gave them three choices and I got my first choice. I got a call about two weeks after I submitted my name, and they said the President has agreed to send your name to the Senate. And, in fact, I was, after the Secretary, I was the third one that cleared the Senate. So, I was one of the very early ones on board. We have 16 Presidential appointees with Senate confirmation in the Department of the Interior and I was the third one. Actually, we tied for second because we both did it the same day, the Undersecretary and myself. So, that was how I got the job.

JIM: Okay. When you came on as Director, what were the most pressing issues that were confronting you at that time?

CY: Well, one is that we in the Bush administration just wanted to change directions slightly. Bush had said during the campaign that we wanted to be the environmental President. Also, is that I, from my experience up on Capitol Hill, I saw that the BLM needed to broaden its base because it was getting too much over into the commodities side. It was losing a lot of

its broad support on the Hill. Secondly is, I think, that anybody who has any political acumen can read the tea leaves on this is that the American public has changed tremendously in the last 10 years on what they expect out of land management and so what I did was I came up with a very simple policy and statement which I put together on one sheet of paper. The Secretary had asked us at our first political retreat, he brought all of us appointees in, and said, what do you really want to do with your agency? And I sat down on one. And he wanted it on one sheet of paper. And I got mine done very quickly. I just said I want to continue our ties to our traditional users. That's the cowboys, the miners, the oil and gas industry. That's what BLM is viewed by many in the public. And then I want to bring up and give them equal treatment as wildlife cultural resources, recreation, riparian values, and also to bring on line a computer modernization of BLM. So, I wrote that all down on a sheet of paper. And I handed it to the Secretary of Interior. We did that about a week before this retreat. And the Secretary got up and just said, Cy, as far as I'm concerned, as the White House is I'm sure concerned, yours is approved 100 percent, go to it. And so that was my very simple. It was just a very simple outline and when we did that, I basically set the agenda for the Bureau of Land Management. And, in my opinion, we followed through fairly good on it. In fact, we've broadened our support. The Hill's been behind us, and it's been very rewarding experience for my part.

JIM: Okay. Well, that leads me into the other question I have. A couple of people have said that they feel that you have been very successful up on Capitol Hill in getting support and funding for programs that have in the past been very difficult to get funding for. Recreation, wildlife, riparian management. What do you attribute this to? Do you think it's the change on Capitol Hill? Is it the result of your change? Combination of both?

CY: I would say it's mostly the Hill and the Subcommittees, if you've never sat through the appropriation process, and also on the authorization process. Appropriation is definitely the most powerful of the two. The two entities are supposed to be equal but they're not up on the Hill. They always ask, well, why don't you fund this, why don't you ask for

it. And during the Reagan years, we never asked for it. And so, I went in there and I just looked at it very realistically and I went back and I said, I think we could use some dollars in these areas. I don't like to be measured totally on, you know, the dollars for success. Internally, the BLM always measures how much dollars you got. I don't believe that's a good measure in total. It's one measure. We've done very well up on the Hill. We've actually, in the last 2-1/2 years, we've actually got about 165 million more real dollars. And most of it is in two or three programs. But, also it's the, really it's the attitude of the way you approach things. I say, here in Washington, DC, two-thirds is perception and one-third is fact. And really that is very true. If you ever operate most of the issues that come before Congress, if you can ever get all the fluff away from it and really get down to the facts of it and the real hook on it, that's about a third of the issue. Most of the others is fluff around the edges or basically how people feel about it. And so, I changed the feeling. And to change the feeling by not talking down or not throwing out, had numerous meetings with the environmental groups. I never asked, you know, for their support. I just said that you're here, you're a known entity, we got to deal with you, you got to deal with me. And so I just said you know, we're going to keep talking even if you don't like what I'm saying, we're going to be talking. And we've followed up on that. We probably have more meetings down here than you can shake a stick at. We've had some real good outreach efforts. So, I was very lucky on that part too. Another part of it is we actually put together a team here. Most of it was here before I got here. And nobody has a private agenda down here in the top management. Nobody has a personal political axe to grind or gain with somebody else. And we've got a real cohesive team here. And people who view it from the outside say, you guys always speak with the same voice. You're not sharp shooting each other for internal things. And that has probably been one of the biggest blessings I've had. And I made sure that. I did something very different than most other agencies and things did. One is I've been both a career servant and political. And so, I saw that there was always that animosity and threat on the career side if they thought the politicals had too much of a role in it and vice versa. The feeling goes both ways. So, what I did is I want the political oriented people to be the outreach because they're basically selling the program. And I wanted the career people basically to manage it. And that's really the way it's

designed. And so we split the two. We had basically what we call the operations side, which is headed totally career, top to bottom, career. And we have the external affairs side which is political. It has some career people in it too. But that's the political arm of it. There are not political appointees over on the operations side, not one. So, if you get an order in the BLM that goes in the chain of command, you never get it from a political person unless it is from me. And that is really cleaned up. I think there's a good feeling. I have very and I've talked to the career side of this back here, there's hardly any carping about that. I mean there's none. I haven't heard any. They think it works very, very well. Other agencies are starting to look at that. And I just made a conscious effort to do that right when I started. And it's worked out very well. And I've got a good team put together.

JIM: Well, I think you're correct on that cause that was one of my questions that several people I've talked to, these questions had brought what you had done. And they were all very, very pleased. And, of course, these are the career BLM people.

CY: And I think, and also is even on the political side which we have on the political side is external affairs, which we have basically to run these functions. Outreach, public affairs and congressional affairs and then special assistants who basically are my eyes and ears on certain program elements. Excuse me, not program elements but by State. We've kind of split it up by State. And so, what I wanted to do was have in the special assistant categories is have advocates for each State, not running that program but being there in the advocacy for. For example, John Laxalt, his dad was a former senator from Nevada, very prominent politician, and a very good council. He knew the political side, best advocate we could ever get from Nevada. And we talk on a daily basis. Same way on our public affairs chief, Mike Radcliffe, very attuned to what was going on politically in Colorado and an advocate for Colorado. And we just went around, and we assigned different states to everybody. Everyone has an advocate for them in the special assistance. And there is career special assistance too to do the same thing. And so, we have kind of the advocate for the external role but

we don't have these special assistants managing programs or trying to manage them. And it's worked out very well.

JIM: Well, good.

CY: It's done by design.

JIM: Since we won't have all that much time on this and since we're only talking about really your first year and just some of the impressions, I guess, we'll talk about some of the issues you've had to deal with. Grazing, of course, is the perennial issue with the public lands since 1934. And since you've been on board, that's no change. And, of course, the real, the two big issues have been (1) the Cattle-free by ’93 movement that some environmental groups want to remove all livestock grazing from public lands and then the other issue has been the attempt to raise grazing fees. The latest attempt being at the end of the last Congress. Congressman Mike Synar tried to raise the fee from about $1.81 and animal unit month about $8.70. He's saying that is what the private sector is getting. How are you reacting to all of this or how do you view all of this from your first year?

CY: I guess I have to step back about 8 months, 9 months into my first year. I had only been aboard a short period of time. I went to speak at the National Press Club to the National Conservation Writers type things. About the fourth question out, one of them said, when are you going to propose a change in the grazing fee? And I'm a very upfront person. I just looked over, it happened to be a lady, and I said, ma'am, I'm not on a suicide mission. I said, I'm not going to propose to raise the grazing fee. Cause that's not, in my opinion, the real issue. The real issue is how we're managing the forage. The grazing fee is a political determination and it's a social statement and an economic statement from Congress. We have support programs, and the grazing thing is a drop in the bucket compared to our other agricultural support programs. So, I said, as far as I'm concerned, I don't care what the grazing fee is. I don't care if it's zero or $20, whatever Congress wants

to do that's what they're going to do. I said the real issue from my standpoint is how the manage the forage. And after I started framing the argument like that, (1) I'm very comfortable with that and (2) is if you get out and you really get down to the root of the environmental arguments on that, it's the same thing. They're arguing about how to manage the forage. So, after that whole cycle thing went on there, this was before Synar brought up his amendment, which he's worked on for 8 years. It's nothing new for Mike Synar. I knew that if it ever got to a House vote, it would pass, and I guessed it would pass by 100 plus votes. It passed by 95. It's a very easy, framed issue if you're trying to beat it. It's easy to say they're not getting fair market value; they're taking the taxpayers. It was very well framed for it. So, what I did I went. Before that, though, is I said, we've got Recreation 2000, we've got Fish and Wildlife 2000, we seem to have a program that points where we're going in these other areas. It's something we can be measured by. It's something that the interest groups are for it. Or even if they're against it, can hook on to or fight in segments. I said we have nothing for this, for the livestock industry, which is probably one of the most political contingencies that we have. So, we put together, which is called the Range of Our Vision, and it's the first time that we've ever put down on paper where we wanted the BLM to end up at a certain time period. The Range of Our Vision, we picked a date, the diamond jubilee of the Taylor Grazing Act, 2009. I said I want a realistic, no fluff in it. I said where we can we be at in the year 2009 and what will it take to get there? And so we went, first of all, we went through the set where we wanted to get forage-wise. And I said, okay, I agree with those goals. Let's back it up. Where do we need to be dollars-wise? And so they put down they needed about, I think it was 54 million per year if we could get that averaged by the year 2000, we'd hit our goals in the range program which was to bring. And another thing is and we're also changing this. We're not going to have excellent, good, fair, and poor. It's a lousy way to do it and range and the scientists guys all tell us you got to do different measure because you're measuring in forage for more than just livestock. And so, what they said, why don't you go to the scientific terms and start reframing it that way. So, we went to early seral, mid seral, late seral and climax, which makes sense to me too. So, really what you want to do is you want to get all your management. You don't want it all in climax cause then you have very few management objectives can be

reached there. Wildlife objectives, most of them aren't met there. And you don't want them in early seral cause that's mostly bare ground. So, you want to get them all in the middle. And in the middle, you can have management objectives. So that was our goal. And what we did is just said, if someone gets up there on climax, I'm not worried about that. But the bottom line is you're working on what's in the old poor category or the early seral. So, I said our goal is to get that to about 10 percent of the range which is 179 million acres. Ten percent of the 179 is our goal because you have fire disease and others. You can never get much below, maybe down to eight. But eight to ten percent. So, we did that and surprisingly our funding is getting to almost to our goal already per year on range. The range guys almost fell over dead. But we laid out to Congress we laid out to the staffs up there of where we're going. And that's kind of the first blueprint they saw. So, that's where we're heading on that. I think the cattle industry has never supported the budget for the range program before. And I think in the near future, they'll probably start signing on to this because they can see the good things that happen to us. One other side mode on this has probably come from the Bureau itself and the hard work of guys like Wayne Elmore out in the riparian work where he went in and looked at it realistically and looped in the livestock operator and showed that there was some benefits to doing some better management by this way. Coupled with that is also we're dealing with a new generation of guys out on the range. They're in their forties. A lot of them have taken over for their parents and run the family operation now. Many view the word differently as you and I view it differently from our parents. So, that's a change, too. It's there. But I think over the long run, we're heading down the right track now. The thing is it takes time. I mean, you can't throw many more dollars, you can't make things by putting dollars on stuff, you can't make it grow better or get more moisture. It just takes a long time. It's a long answer to a short question.

JIM: That's true, but going back a little bit to the Cattle-free by ’93 movement, do you feel that that really has any real support or is that just more really just rhetoric?

CY: I think there's two things you want to keep in mind on Cattle-free by ’93 and some of these groups that are on the

peripheral edge. There are about five groups or six groups and it's a social agenda with them. Cattle-free by ’93 has been basically earth first proposition which has violence, fringe groups and things like that. In other ones, you have animal rights activists. That's another one. Other ones, you have anti-red meat groups. And then you have some other ones that are {**spunners**} that are slowly moving over here as green, the green part in West Germany passed a law that on, that you couldn't have catch and release fishing because it was cruelty to the fish. You have all those groups kind of on a peripheral edge but they're all starting to kind of work together on certain things, so they're probably going to have to be dealt with but I think as long as we're marching down where most of the Americans are, that's the bottom line's on forage. How to manage the forage. The rest would still be a voice and I hope in the wilderness.

JIM: Okay. As long as we're with the livestock industry and we've talked about President Bush's change of agenda, the way you view things, looking more towards bringing recreation, wildlife, other things up. It has been reported that there is well, for instance, in the Washington Times last November that the Sagebrush Rebellion has been resurrected and that it is somewhat in response to the environmental policies of the Bush administration. And there have been some meetings. There was a meeting apparently last month in Nevada. There was a meeting this last weekend in Rock Springs, Wyoming. How do you view all of this?

CY: First of all, if you read their rhetoric, and they went through the issues that they said were to recall the or reinstitute the Sagebrush Rebellion, I think they had about eight or nine issues. And one of them dealt with the BLM. And that was they felt we were running our riparian program basically to long. If you really get down to look at it and I know the heads of it. I've met them. They're sincere individuals and I don't question their motives. They're really afraid that their lifestyle is going to change. And I have concern about that too. Some of them are in long, long, long-term running battles with the BLM and probably will be til our management objectives and theirs become more in the same tune. So, if you look at that, I expect some of that. Secondly is if

you looked at the Sagebrush Rebellion and looked at who attended some of those meetings, most of the other key groups were not there. And I think a lot of that is they called and told us they weren't going to be there. And gave us very clear signals that this was a very segmented view of it. Also, there's some activist attorneys out there that are stirring the pot up. And a couple of them, I know personally and there after kind of business in that area and that's one way to do it. I look at it as something to deal with. I'm not afraid of it. I think we're still on the right track. It's really just a couple of sales in a couple of areas.

JIM: Okay. We're going to break here to turn over the tape.

JIM: Let's continue to spotted owl. I'm sorry. I forgot to turn that on.

CY: Where are we at now? What's the question? Spotted owls.

JIM: How do you view BLM's part or how or what has been BLM's part in that controversy?

CY: Okay, spotted owls. We'll start over again and I'll just give you a little. One as I said before is on T&A is a very tough law, has a big camera on. And it just happens to be that the spotted owls, the first mega one of those to come forward. And the BLM is a major player in it. About between 25 and 40 percent of that _____. Also is that this is the first one across state boundaries, affects two and three states rather than a timber sale or a road right-of-way or pipeline right-of-way. Those we could handle because we could either build it around it or we built over it or we did mitigation work, did it someplace else. On the owls, we can't do that. We're dealing with three state areas, 17 or 18 million acres of land and we as a Nation have not decided how we're going to handle those mega environmental T&A issues. I've been roundly criticized by the

industry side for being too environmental on it. And the opposite is true with the environmental group. They said I was in the industry's hip pocket. What I do is I looked at it and I said, Bush told us and Sinoua told us, and Porter told me personally _____ the _____ policy. He says take a balanced approach. And so, what I did was I tried to come up with something that would give us a little bit of breathing room in the interim. And what I did was I said is I want to run this whole issue through our planning system because we're at the end of our decadal plans out now. And you just can't macro manage for one thing on the lands. It doesn't work. We've proved it time and time again. One of them is we just managed for forest and that's why we ended up with some problems we got now. We're finding out you got to look at things in a multiple use and a multiple ecosystem type thing. So, they said go ahead. And I did and I want to run it through our planning system, let the local on-the-ground BLM people come up with the best thing they can. And also they, BLM people tend to work very well in communities and come up with, I wouldn't say a total consensus approach, but everybody knows what the rules are and everybody knows why the decision was made. So, we're going to do that. The White House has supported us on that. The Secretary supported me strongly on that. And I think the proof is going to be in the pudding. I've made it through one year already that they said we'd never make it through. And we'll have the next batch of timber sales ready to go over in probably the next couple of weeks which will take us through the next year. I think we'll make it through that one. And everybody said we're heading for a big wreck, and I don't see it happening.

JIM: You also you believed that the spotted owl issue is really a land use issue.

CY: Oh, absolutely yeah. I may have failed to mention that again is really the bottom line on that is that it's old growth forest. It's basically urban sprawl and urban growth. It's the Californians versus some of the old time Oregonians up in that area. And also, it's a way of life. You're going to change the way people view things. And there's some people that feel that if, you know, we cut one tree, it's too many and if you don't cut them all, then others feel if you don't cut them

all, you're not doing your job. And somewhere in between lies the answer, I think.

JIM: Okay. Going back to sort of a grazing issue. Wild horses, another perennial problem for the Bureau. The General Accounting Office last fall released a report that was somewhat critical of BLM. Essentially because they feel that the policy in dealing with wild horses as well as grazing had failed to improve rangeland conditions. What has BLM been doing since you been here.

CY: I've got some major problems with the way GAO does business. I'll just give you that and I've told that right to the number two man. I know how the get their requests for studies up on the Hill. I know how it's done, and I don't hold them as high in some categories as the general public is lead to believe that they are. They're very good on some accounting and checking things, but when they go out and look at a program, they usually go with an agenda from the Hill which is to come out with, slanted out in one way, so I look at their reports with a jaundiced eye to be honest with you. Secondly is it's probably the most frustrating program that I got. It's, they way, the hands that I've been dealt with it's almost if I can come out with draw on it, I'd be lucky but the cards I got aren't the best. And I'm trying to slowly change that. Let me tell you what, if a program is out of balance for the money that Congress has given us, there is no way we can run that program under the law. The second issue that you have is some of the groups there that are oblivious to really on-the-ground part of the management scheme. And until they change that, I don't believe that they realize that some of those horses are basically eating themselves out of house and home. You can't have a total unmanaged population out there on a finite resource. And until that view is changed or Congress gives us a little bit more leeway, we're going to be in a wreck situation. We're slowing winning all the court cases, though. But it's too slow. In fact, our numbers since I've been on board have went from about 38,000 animals that were on the range to almost 50. They're increasing at about 18 to 20 percent per year. Our removal dollars, we've been stopped on removal. So here what you have, we have two sanctuaries that Congress said to try and after 3 years, they'll fund themselves. In my opinion, neither

one is going to be self-funded. Secondly is you have, they stopped us from gathering in many instances. Third is we built up a prison program which we haven't got horses in right now. We've probably got room for a thousand horses in the prison program and what have we got, maybe a thousand more horses. Probably got 800 and now we've got almost 2,000. And then you couple that in with some of our fertility work and everything like that. So, what we're doing is I've got to make some tough decisions. We put together the Wildhorse and Burro Board again as Congress directed us to do. We put, we did it non-politically. In fact, I went through a lot of steps to get those appointed for the skills and not for what their politics were. And we put that together. We've put on some of the animal rights activists on it. And if they can't come to an agreement here or some good sound suggestions that are workable in the next 6 to 8 months, I'm going to make some tough decisions on horse _____. What those will be I don't know but we've gone along long enough trying to bandaid this thing and put it together is going to make some tough cuts.

JIM: Okay.

CY: Stay tuned.

JIM: One other resource issue has been the attempts to repeal the General Mining Law of 1872 and replace it with some sort of leasing system. Both the Department and BLM have been somewhat opposed to it.

CY: There's no doubt about it.

JIM: What have your feelings been to those efforts?

CY: I'm very familiar with the law from working up on the Hill. And let me tell you what. One is we can take of many of the issues that are "driving" it right now. A lot of it, the abuses as some say to mining law were environmentally

orientated. No reclamation, things like that. So, what we've done is I've tried to do in the last 6, 8 months is to get those off the platter cause I can take care of those administratively through rules and regulations. Bonding reclamation, occupancy. We're going to, if a guy doesn't have a family or whatever it is, doesn't have a legitimate mining interest or reason to be there, they're going to get kicked off shortly. And that rules is floating its way through the system right now. So, we'll bring the hammer down on that. And also, on the environmental side is we'll have a bonding and reclamation policy that will take care of that. One area which I agree with, and I personally think it needs to be taken care of, we need some legislation on this is the $2.50 an acre. It's a fee, it's not fair market value or anything else. The public doesn't understand it just like the grazing fee. The public doesn't understand it. And for the very few acres that we patent each year, I think we had 40 parcels or 38 last year, let's just charge fair market value or let's split the stake, keep the surface, and give them the minerals. And let's get that off the chart. I agree that needs to be changed. We'll have to do that legislatively. But I think we ought to keep the four tenets of the mining law need to be maintained because it's the American way to do things. One is we need to have self-initiation - you go out and look for it. The Federal Government doesn't know where and tell you where and when to try to go look for it. Secondly, is you have to able to go look if it needs some access. Third is you have to have some _____ of deposit if you find it. You have to able to maximize your hard work and effort and be able to do that. And then fourth, we need to have it done in a diligent manner. In other words, you can't sit out there and speculate on that type of thing. Those are the four things that need to be maintained. If you fine tune it or do something else, we can probably buy off on it. But let me tell you some of the downfalls of the two systems that's been proposed. One is it's a leasing system which I'm opposed to. Two it leases it on cardinal, eloquent parts. We haven't got eloquent parts in a lot of the west as you probably know from looking around. So, I mean it's a major, it would be a major nightmare from a survey standpoint. And also, from a recordation standpoint. So, if you take some of those mechanical things that they think will help the system, do it. The one open question that, at the present that we're opposed to is a royalty. The reason we're opposed to it is we haven't found a administratively manageable way to collect it. I mean

there are some many differences. It's not like oil and gas where you can get up and measure it in a barrel. You know, an ounce of gold comes out, in some places, comes out of, you know, 2500 tons of river gravel where an ounce of gold comes out of 200 pounds of rock. And so, it's really hard to get a system that's fair to both to collect the public share on it. So, until someone devises a better system or something's that's manageable, I'm going to be opposed to royalty because I don't think it gains us that much.

JIM: Okay.

CY: That in a nutshell is where we're at.

JIM: We're quickly running out of time, and I have at least four more questions. Automation, you mentioned that in the beginning. The Bureau's efforts to automate both its land and mineral records as well as some of its resource records. What do you see, I mean, there have obviously been problems. What do you see the problems as and where do you hope we can go from here?

CY: Okay. When I first came on board, I was aware of the program from doing field visits and stuff when I, before I come down here. I got took when I first got here. I was told that things all fit together, and they all made sense in a big picture sort of way and so I went gung ho for it. Cause here you're talking maybe 700 million over the next 10 to 12 years. It's a big purchase. And so, I stuck with that. And people come up, friends come up and start saying, hey, this thing doesn't fit together, and it isn't well thought out. It isn't going to work. OMB finally just said no. And then that really made me look. And the more I dug and the more I dug, the more I found out they were right. So, we switched gears. Dean Stepanek took under, he was the number two man here, took it under his wing and really fared it out. So what we did is we finally reached agreement with OMB to basically get a couple of programs up and running and if we can show a good track record there, we'll go on to the next steps. And those are ALMRS, the

land recordation system, and is it GCBD or some damn thing like that. We'll get that up and running and also it could get us to open the door to replace some of our aging equipment. My goal is that BLM ought to be in, you know, try to bring the BLM from the early ’50's up to the ’90's and one short year just doesn't happen automation-wise. If I can get us in the early ’70's before I leave here I'll _____ it is. I mean we have major problems with just the phone systems around here. BLM has let a lot of these internal things probably slide past the point we should have and now we're having to spend a lot of dollars to try to catch up technically to the systems. And boy, it's just a, it's a mess. But I'm confident now that we've reorganized, we did _____ down at the Service Center, we've done a roles and function statement. I think we have given clear message of where we want it to go. OMB understands that message and OMB has bought off on it. So, we've got a track record for funding now to go on.

JIM: One thing you've also initiated is sort of a scientific research program. The Bureau has generally said it's not a research organization, but we seem to be moving a little bit in that direction. Why and, I guess, where do you feel you'd like to see it go.

CY: We spend a lot of money and BLM does more damn studies than anybody I've ever seen. It's study this and study that. And I really can see where some of the other agencies are heading. Forest Service, they got a big fix cost by owning their experimental stations. Also, if you can tie in to a University, that becomes a fixed cost anyway because politically you can't get out of it. Bureau of Mines is a fine example of that with the mineral institutes. So, I looked at that and said, geez where do we really want to go on this? And we've got a Subcommittee that's really active and a Public Lands Council looking at that right now. Also, we're looking at it. We don't have a good answer to that yet, but I think some kind of a mix with maybe one or two centers that do will be the best, but I don't have the answer. But I don't want to get down the road so far that we can't get the BLM spin on it. I want us to spin it rather than somebody else.

JIM: Okay. Other things, real quick. It has been pointed out that the Bureau of Land Management is well respected and well liked at the Secretary level, which has not always been the case. Frank Gregg always complained that Andrus really didn't care much for the Bureau of Land Management. What do you attribute that to?

CY: Well, part of it is to me. I'm going to take credit on that. I happen to know the Secretary very well personally. I worked four grey doors down the hallway from him off and on for ten years. Two is I speak the same language he does. I mean I don't speak Spanish, but I mean I speak the same resource language. We have, I gained a lot of the same base of knowledge where he comes from on that. Also is we have a pretty good vision of where we're going down here and where we wanted to go. I've been told by him and top staff up there, our Bureau is probably running one of the best of any of them in the Department right now. And a couple of that is from the hard work of a lot of these people around here, not me, I just kind of take credit for. But that is, it's probably. And also is I beat the drums, you got to have a good outreach effort which we've worked on. And also you have to be well prepared when you go up. We have usually mortar board most of our policy changes or our thrust fairly well before we ever walk up the. Everybody says, I can never get a mining _____ and reclamation law or a regulation change through. We did it. You know how many letters I got back on that? One letter, one letter in the whole United States. So, we're well respected at the White House too.

JIM: Good.

CY: I was very proud of the Domestic Policy Council stood up at a, where they had all the SES Conference. I beamed after this. I'm going to brag for a second. We walked in and he says, you know, I'm good to be down here with Secretary Lujan and I just want to say you've got good managers like Cy Jamison working on the BLM. And that was from a domestic policy. That's the number two guy over, you know, there's national security, foreign policy, and domestic policy and that's him right under the President. So, we're there.

JIM: Good. Last question, two-parter. And perhaps you really don't have to answer this first one. What are the most pressing issues facing the BLM today? We pretty much discussed that. But and you just sort of went into this. What do you hope to accomplish in BLM over, let's say in the next three years or two years?

CY: Up on the Hill, we need to basically, we're still on a tether up there. They're seeing if we can produce and what we've got to do is up on the Hill is step down our programs to a deliverable results. We've got to prove ourselves in that. That's where I, and that takes time cause from the time they fund you to the time that project or something's done out on the Hill, then the field needs to be, it takes three years. So, that is something we're going to have to hang with. The Hill wants measurable results now. They don't like to just fund program bases. They want to see where there's dollars involved. That is one of the things I want to keep on track. Secondly, I want to make the Bureau of Land Management an expert in one. The President has an educational initiative and I want to get us. Like the Bureau of Mines is the expert on the education thing. Now this is to the public not internal. It's not a research type thing. But the Bureau of Mines has these rock programs. The minerals identification. They go to all schools. So, they're the experts on it and they're doing it. I want us to have a program like that in the BLM and be recognized in an educational field, probably a bachelor's degree, as the leading expert to go to for educational assistance. We need to develop that. Looking tentatively at probably right now cultural resources is to be that area. And historical resources, Mr. Muhn.

JIM: Does that mean there's going to be a BLM history program?

CY: But that is what we're doing. Cause I think, after I saw what happened on back country byways, and I went out to Colorado and took that tour and I saw those people that were 90 years old get up and tell the history and everybody around there, some of them had tears in their eyes thinking about, I

said, we in the BLM can better tie to that local history than just about anybody out there cause we're mixed in with the people by our scattered line pattern. And so, I said why can't we do that and then tie to the cultural resources on a broad basis, not just, you know, like the Park is basically on that little cultural resource right there but on the broad basis, how can we do that? So, that is one of things I want to get up and running. Two others probably is that I want to step down our recreation program one more time and get it going. We've got still real rough edges on some of that. Also, we need to better define Fish and Wildlife 2000. Everybody says that's 2000, but we need to define the individual components of that better. And then thirdly is that we need to make sure that we in the BLM have empathy for the lifestyles that are in our areas of management. So, if I can keep those things, if I can still move on to that, those all tie together.

JIM: Good. Well, I think we'll call this a day. And I want to thank you.

CY: An hour and five minutes and I told you everything I knew.

JIM: Good. Thank you.

CY: Okay, thanks, Jim.